

Objective 5

Humanitarian Assistance

5.1 – Protection, Assistance and Solutions

Indicator	5.1-2 Percentage of refugees admitted to the U.S. against the regional ceilings established by Presidential Determination
Definition	Data for this indicator is entered at the bureau level by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM). This indicator measures the annual percentage of refugees admitted to the U.S. against the regional ceilings established by Presidential Determination. The Presidential Determination on Refugee Admissions for each fiscal year is signed by the President (ideally) before the start of a new fiscal year, establishing the regional ceilings, or maximum number of refugees that may be admitted to/resettled in the United States from each of five regions (Africa, East Asia, Europe, Latin America/Caribbean and Near East/South Asia). Numerator: The total number of refugees admitted to the U.S. in a fiscal year Denominator: The total combined regionally allocated ceilings on refugee admissions established each year in the Presidential Determination
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	In support of the foreign policy objectives of promoting stability and protecting human dignity, the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) seeks to achieve three durable solutions for refugees: voluntary return and reintegration, permanent local integration in host countries, or third-country resettlement. Resettlement is a key element of PRM's efforts to find durable solutions to refugee displacement when repatriation and local integration are not viable solutions. As the world's largest resettlement country, the United States advances this goal through welcoming the most vulnerable refugees to communities across the country.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	Reporting to Department of State Bureaus (F and RM), Congress, and nongovernmental stakeholders, for accountability of funds spent. The information generated by this indicator does not necessarily affect how PRM plans numbers for out-years. If we are less than successful at achieving 100% of the regionally allocated ceilings, it is normally because we faced unexpected obstacles that may not exist in the following year, such as the imposition of a new security clearance requirement, or major unrest in a significant processing location.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Refugee admissions numbers are officially tracked and reported by the Refugee Processing Center, a PRM contractor in Rosslyn, VA. The data is available on a weekly basis, but reported on annually.
Known Data Limitations	• The data are valid, as they rely on direct, official reporting of refugee admissions numbers. • The data cannot be manipulated, as they are stored in a password-protected database operated by a PRM contractor. • The data are precise and present a fair picture of performance, although many of the factors that prevent us from achieving full

	success are beyond our control. • The data are reliable and have been collected by PRM contractors for several decades. • The data are available on a weekly basis.
Baseline Timeframe	The level of refugee admissions in a given year will be determined by the President in consultation with the Congress in the previous year.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

5.1.1. Protection and Solutions

Indicator	5.1.1-3 Percentage of NGO or other international organization projects that include dedicated activities to prevent and/or respond to gender-based violence
Definitions	<u>Numerator</u>: Number of USG-funded NGO or international organization projects that include dedicated activities to prevent and/or respond to gender-based violence <u>Denominator</u>: Total number of USG-funded NGO or international organization projects in the reporting year Dedicated activities include activities designed specifically to respond to gender-based violence (GBV) prevention or response. Various implementation activities may include components that contribute in some way to a decreased risk of gender inequity or the potential for violence—these are consistent with the USG’s intent to mainstream protection. However, in order to be considered dedicated to preventing and/or responding to GBV, a specific activity must be designed and implemented with GBV prevention and/or response as the primary purpose of its inclusion in a project. Gender-based Violence: Gender-based violence is an umbrella term for any harm that is perpetrated against a person’s will, and that results from power inequities that are based on gender roles. Around the world, gender-based violence almost always has a greater negative impact on women and girls. For this reason the term "gender-based violence" is often used interchangeably with the term "violence against women." One reason the term "gender-based violence" is often considered preferable to other terms that describe violence against women is that it highlights the relationship between women’s subordinate status in society and their increased vulnerability to violence. However, it is important to remember that in some cases men and boys may also be victims of gender-based violence. Violence may be physical, sexual, psychological, economic, or socio-cultural. Categories of perpetrators may include family, community members, and/or those acting on behalf of cultural, religious, or state institutions. Gender: Refers to the social differences between men and women that are learned, and though deeply rooted in every culture, are changeable over time, and have wide variations both within and between cultures. Violent Episode: An act or series of acts of violence or abuse by one perpetrator or group of perpetrators. May involve multiple types of violence (physical, sexual, emotional, economic, socio-cultural); and may involve repetition of violence over a period of minutes, hours, or days. Survivor: Person who has experienced violence or other abuse. Secondary Survivor: Person impacted by the experience of gender-based violence inflicted upon the survivor. May include family members or others close to the survivor. Perpetrator: Person, group, or institution that directly inflicts or otherwise supports violence or other abuse inflicted on another against her/his will. Intimate Partner: Includes current or former spouses (legal and common law), non-marital partners (boyfriend, girlfriend, same-sex partner, dating partner). Intimate partners may or may not be cohabitating and

	the relationship need not involve sexual activities. Minor: Person under the age of 18 (according to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child). (Definitions derived from the <u>Gender-based Violence Tools Manual for Assessment & Program Design, Monitoring & Evaluation in Conflict-Affected Settings</u>, Reproductive Health Response in Conflict Consortium, the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the World Health Organization.)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the extent of the commitment by USG-funded projects to specifically address the prevention and response to GBV with an anticipated long-term outcome of reduced incidence in GBV during natural disasters and complex emergencies
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to measure it	Unit of Measure: USG-funded projects (number/percent) How to measure it: Count the number of USG-funded NGO or international organization projects that include activities designed specifically to prevent and/or respond to gender-based violence. Omit any double-counting by eliminating partner projects that are cost-modifications or no-cost extensions of projects already counted. Divide by the total number of USG projects and multiply by 100 for the percentage.
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Internal award document tracking system and from implementing partner reports (verbal or written) Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	A weakness of this indicator is its inability to report on the quality of GBV program activities or the ultimate achievements of dedicated activities to prevent and/or respond to GBV.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	5.1.1-5 Percentage of the population of concern who have returned home or have been resettled to a third country
Definitions	Data for this indicator is entered at the bureau level by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM). <u>Numerator</u>: The number of individuals in the population of concern for whom durable solutions are found with USG support <u>Denominator</u>: Total number (estimated) of individuals in the population of concern
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the extent of USG commitment and success in finding durable solutions for displaced populations as a result natural and/or technological disasters, and/or complex emergencies
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Unit of Measure: individual refugees/IDPs (percent)
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	5.1.1-6 Percentage of USG-funded NGO or other international organization projects that include activities or services designed to reduce specific risks or harm to vulnerable populations
Definitions	Percentage of USG-funded NGO or other international organization projects that include activities or services designed to reduce specific risks or harm to vulnerable populations. Protection activities or services must go beyond a standard protection mainstreaming approach to: • alleviate the psychosocial and health effects of violations, threats, and abuse of children, youth, women, disabled persons, displaced persons, marginalized ethnic or religious groups, and other vulnerable populations • build the awareness, knowledge, and capacity of governmental, parastatal, NGO, community, or other entities to identify, prevent, and reduce the risk of abuse, violence, and other threats to vulnerable groups • provide legal protection; and/or • build policy and advocacy for local, regional, and national protection systems, personnel, and protocols in accordance with protection principles (e.g., Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement; Human Rights Law; International Humanitarian Law; 1951 Refugee Convention) Numerator: Number of USG-funded NGO projects that have been identified as including activities or serviced designed to reduce specific risks or harm to vulnerable populations. Adjust the numerator, as necessary, following a review of NGO and IO reports. Denominator: Total number of NGO or international organization (IO) projects supported with USG funding in the reporting period
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the extent of the commitment by USG-funded projects to reduce specific risks or harm to vulnerable populations. This indicator measures the extent to which protection, assistance, and solution activities funded by the USG in humanitarian assistance include dedicated protection programming efforts. Evidence suggests that increased vulnerability during complex humanitarian emergencies may lead to a rise in abuse, particularly sexual violence. Anticipated long-term outcomes include reduced incidence or degree of psychosocial and health effects of violations, threats, and less abuse of children, youth, women, disabled persons, displaced persons, marginalized ethnic or religious groups, and other vulnerable populations during natural disasters and complex emergencies
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Internal award tracking system (<i>abacus</i>), field monitoring reports, and implementing partner reports. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	This indicator reflects the number of projects that include activities to prevent and/or respond to protection concerns, such as GBV, but it does

	not reflect the quality of such interventions or the outcome of activities.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

5.1.2 Assistance and Recovery

Indicator	5.1.2-3 Percentage of planned emergency food aid beneficiaries reached with USG assistance
Definitions	Beneficiaries refer to direct beneficiaries; those who come into direct contact with the goods or services provided by the program. Services include training and technical assistance provided directly by program staff, and training and technical assistance provided by people who have been trained by program staff (e.g., agricultural extension agents, village health workers.) Direct beneficiaries do not include those who benefit indirectly from the goods and services provided to the direct beneficiaries (e.g., farmers from a neighboring community who might observe the effects of the training and demonstration plots in the target community and decide to adopt or model the new practices themselves or the population of all of the communities in a valley that uses a road improved by food for work [FFW]). Direct beneficiaries are counted as individuals, not households. Individuals and family members receiving food rations (in the case of family rations), and individuals who receive training or benefit from program supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries. In a FFW program, direct beneficiaries are those who participate in building the infrastructure. Reached: Defined as contact with a beneficiary regardless of the number of times or amount of assistance received in a given technical sector. If an individual benefits from multiple interventions within a sector, s/he should only be counted once. If an individual benefits from interventions in multiple sectors, s/he should be counted once in each sector from which s/he has received benefits (see “Data limitations” below). Numerator: Number of direct beneficiaries reached Denominator: Number of planned direct beneficiaries (# of direct beneficiaries reached / # of planned direct beneficiaries) * 100
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the extent of disaster assistance and recovery provided with USG support. While this indicator is an output indicator, the effectiveness of the programs in reaching their planned beneficiaries is an important prerequisite to increased field-level impact. Successfully reaching planned beneficiaries is especially important for protecting lives and livelihoods (i.e., protecting human capacities, livelihood capabilities and community resilience).
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Individual beneficiary (percent) How to measure it: Count the number of direct beneficiaries reached, divide this number into the number of planned direct beneficiaries, and multiply by 100 for the percent. Omit any double-counting by adjusting for overlap of various activities in a region, by activity and/or implementing partner.
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and	Data Source: Internal awards tracking systems and implementing partner

Reporting Frequency	reports Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	In the past, lack of a consistent definition of “direct beneficiary” has limited the ability to compare and aggregate the numbers reported by CSs. Total planned direct beneficiaries and total direct beneficiaries reached are the sum of the planned beneficiaries or beneficiaries reached in each technical sector (Agriculture/ Natural Resource Management, Education, Health and Nutrition, Civil Society Strengthening, Emergency Preparedness/ Disaster Mitigation, Non-Agriculture-based Income Generation, Water and Sanitation, Vulnerable Group Feeding/ Social Safety Net). These sums will double-count individuals who received benefits in more than one sector (e.g. a female farmer with a child who benefited from the agriculture intervention and the health and nutrition intervention.) This method of calculating total beneficiaries is consistent with the Agency approach. Given how project management information systems are designed, it is not realistic to expect Cooperating Sponsors to track individuals across sectors in order to calculate a total that doesn’t double-count.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	Sex; disabled/not; IDP/host; technical sector; HIV/non-HIV activities; Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	5.1.2-4 Percentage of surveyed refugee camps in protracted situations where global acute malnutrition (GAM) does not exceed 10 percent
Definitions	Data for this indicator is entered at the bureau level by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM). Surveyed sites are those sites provided with USG humanitarian assistance for which data on the general health of the population (as measured by levels of malnutrition, sickness, or death) is tracked through repeat surveys, including anthropometric surveys. Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) includes all malnourished children from 6 to 59 months of age with moderate or severe wasting, edema, or some combination of these conditions. GAM is defined as weight-for-height ratios less than two standard deviations below the mean (z-score < -2.0) or less than 80% median weight-for-height, or the presence of nutritional edema.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Nutritional status is a sensitive indicator for assessing the severity of a humanitarian crisis. In emergencies, weight loss among children 6-59 months of age is used as a proxy indicator for the general health of the entire community or population of interest.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Surveyed sites How to measure it: Derive an average of the prevalence of GAM (as measured and reported from anthropometric survey data) across monitored/surveyed sites identified as protracted refugee situations
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Anthropometric surveys made available through the United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (UN SCN), Nutrition Information in Crisis Situations (NICS), EM-DAT, and other sources. Nutrition data derive from surveys that use a probabilistic sampling methodology that complies with agreed-upon international standards (i.e., WHO, Standardized Monitoring and Assessment of Relief and Transition [SMART] Methodology, and <i>Médécins sans Frontières</i>). Reporting Frequency: Annual and ongoing, as data are made available
Known Data Limitations	Limitations as to access and timing of anthropometric surveys, as well as confounding environmental/contextual factors may influence GAM rates
Baseline Timeframe	Prior to a USG-supported disaster response
Disaggregate(s)	Sex; Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	5.1.2-5 Percentage of surveyed refugee camps in protracted situations where the mortality rate of children under five does not exceed emergency thresholds
Definitions	Data for this indicator is entered at the bureau level by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM). Monitored sites are those sites provided with USG humanitarian assistance for which data on the general health of the population (as measured by levels of malnutrition, sickness, or death) is tracked through repeat surveys, including anthropometric surveys. Crude death rate (CMR) is defined as the frequency of death in a defined population during a specified time interval (e.g., in a given year), as derived by the per capita death rate in a population (e.g., a camp, region, or country affected by the refugee situation and/or disaster). Numerator: The number of monitored refugee sites receiving USG support as a response to a complex humanitarian crisis or natural disaster, for which data are available in which the CMR does not exceed emergency thresholds. Denominator: Total number of monitored refugee sites receiving USG support as a response to a complex humanitarian crisis or natural disaster, for which CMR data are available. How to measure it: Divide the denominator by the numerator and multiply by 100 for a percent
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	General and under-five crude death rates provide a rough measure of the circumstances of a population. A CMR greater than 4 deaths per 10,000 persons per day represents a major catastrophe in an emergency phase; greater than 2/10,000/day but no more than 4/10,000/day is out of control; greater than 1 but less than or equal to 2/10,000/day is considered serious; and less than 1/10,000/day is considered under control.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Unit of Measure: monitored sites (reported as a percentage)
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: TBD Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	5.1.2-6 Number of internally displaced and host population beneficiaries provided with basic inputs for survival, recovery or restoration of productive capacity as a result of USG assistance
Definitions	“Beneficiaries” refers to direct beneficiaries; when interventions are provided to an individual in the household, the entire household is considered a direct beneficiary. An example of indirect beneficiaries would be the other households in the community who benefit only indirectly as a result of the most vulnerable household having received direct support. Indicator measures the number of beneficiaries that have received support/assistance by USG-supported humanitarian assistance and disaster response activities.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the extent of disaster assistance and recovery provided with USG support. The provision of basic inputs for survival, recovery or restoration of productive capacity is linked to a long-term outcome of the restored health and economy of a population.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Individual beneficiary (number) How to measure it: Count the number of beneficiaries that have received support/assistance by USG-funded humanitarian assistance. Omit any double-counting by adjusting for overlap of various activities in a region, by activity and/or implementing partner.
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Internal awards tracking systems (<i>Abacus</i>) and other sources, including implementing partner reports, and verbal or written reports from regional teams. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	A weakness of this indicator is its inability to reflect appropriate identification and targeting of eligible beneficiaries or the quality of humanitarian assistance activities.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, disabled/not, IDP/host

5.2 – Disaster Readiness

Indicator	5.2-3 Percentage of host country and regional teams and/or other stakeholder groups implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to natural disasters as a result of USG assistance within the previous 5 years
Definitions	For the purpose of this indicator, host country teams, regional teams, and stakeholder groups are those "teams," "groups," or entities receiving technical, material, capacity building, and other support designed to improve risk reduction and resilience to natural disasters (seismic, volcanic, hydro meteorological, pest-related, etc.) with USG funding. In some cases, a team or group may be represented by an individual attending a meteorological forecasting and data analysis training, for example. In other instances, an entire country seismology team may receive training and supervision in seismometer installation and data analysis. These entities (individual, group, or team) are the area, topical, country, or regional team or an individual tasked with planning and carrying out ongoing disaster risk reduction, preparedness, and mitigation related to natural disaster risks. Natural disasters include hydro meteorological, geo-hazards, and biological (e.g., human health and pest infestations) disasters. This indicator can be used for climate change adaptation reporting. Numerator: The number of host country teams, regional teams, stakeholder groups, and/or individual units who received (within the last 5 years) technical, material, capacity building, and other support with USG funding designed to improve risk reduction and resilience to natural disasters who, in the current reporting year implemented risk-reducing practices or actions to improve resilience to natural disasters. Denominator: The total number of host country teams, regional teams, stakeholder groups, and/or individual units who received (within the last 5 years) technical, material, capacity building, and other support with USG funding designed to improve risk reduction and resilience to natural disasters How to measure it: Divide the denominator by the numerator and multiply by 100 for a percent.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator reflects the extent to which capacity building and technical and material support for improved disaster risk reduction have led to local applications and sustainability of USG-funded efforts.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Individual, team, or group (reported as a percent)
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Internal award tracking system (<i>abacus</i>), third-party reporting, IO reporting, NGO reports, individual contacts, etc. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	The implementation or application of training is likely to follow some years after USG inputs. The numerator will necessarily be a subjective

	estimate initially, although improved data collection mechanisms in the future can improve on data access and reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established (begin 2012?)
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

5.2.1 – Capacity Building, Preparedness and Planning

Indicator	5.2.1-1 Number of countries with early warning systems linked to a response system in place as a result of USG assistance (Bureau reported)
Definitions	Disaster early warning and response systems: There is no one-size-fits-all early warning and response system (EWRS). Acceptable EWRS should contain, at a minimum, indicators that identify increasing stress or on-coming shocks and a means to track and transmit information on them; thresholds, cutoff or triggers for these indicators that indicate when actions needs to be taken, and a response plan to be initiated when these thresholds, cutoffs or triggers are reached.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the output of disaster preparedness capacity building activities. It is linked to a longer-term outcome of strengthened disaster preparedness, which includes both early warning systems and plans for how to respond to shocks when they occur—a central aspect of increasing community resiliency. Improved disaster preparedness is an aspect of community capacity strengthening that is achievable even in relatively short-term responses to emergencies.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Countries (count) How to measure it: Tally the number of countries with early warning systems linked to a response system in place as a result of USG assistance
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Internal awards tracking and program monitoring forms at the implementing partner level; implementing partner quarterly reports at the donor level Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not measure the quality, effectiveness, or applicability/appropriateness of disaster preparedness training. Without follow-up or standardization of curricula, this indicator is subject to some over-reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	5.2.1- 2 Number of people trained in disaster preparedness as a result of USG assistance
Definitions	Disaster preparedness includes: risk identification, analysis, prioritization, and reduction activities; the design and implementation of regional, national, local, or community level hazard reduction policies and plans; early warning systems, as appropriate; and identification of roles and responsibilities in preventing, responding to, and recovering from disasters. Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards, when these exist. Trainings must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Only participants who complete a full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one topic, individuals should only be counted once for that training course. If a training course is conducted in more than one session/training event, only individuals who complete the full course should be counted; do not sum the participants for each training event. If individuals are retrained within the reporting period, having received training prior to the project or reporting period, they should be included in the count.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the output of disaster preparedness capacity building activities. It is linked to a longer-term outcome of utilization of disaster preparedness skills and the improved lead-time, response, risk reduction, and sustainability of disaster preparedness and risk reduction activities.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Individual (count) How to measure it: Tally the number of people trained in disaster preparedness. Ensure that there is no double-counting.
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Program monitoring forms at the implementing partner level; implementing partner quarterly reports at the donor level Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not measure the quality, effectiveness, or applicability/appropriateness of disaster preparedness training. Without follow-up or standardization of curricula, this indicator is subject to some over-reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, disabled/not, IDP/host

Indicator	5.2.1-14 Percentage of USG missions/embassies with trained mission disaster relief officers and/or alternates
Definitions	The Mission Disaster Relief Officer (MDRO) and alternate are appointed by the Chief of Mission and are the focal points at post for disaster-related information, planning, and activities affecting the host country. The MDRO is also the primary point of contact at post for staff from USAID's Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). The MDRO is responsible for preparing and maintaining Annex J of the Emergency Action Plan, entitled Assistance to Host Country in a Major Accident or Disaster, and ensuring that post personnel are familiar with its contents. The MDRO should also be familiar with host government disaster authorities and capabilities and other potential humanitarian assistance partners. MDRO and alternate designations are concomitant duties in addition to a person's full-time responsibilities. Although not a requirement, the MDRO is typically a US citizen and it is recommended that the alternate be a foreign service national to provide consistency and continuity. Training refers to specific disaster relief training designed and provided by OFDA. The OFDA disaster relief training for MDROs has specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Only participants who complete a full training course are counted. Numerator: Number of USG missions/embassies with trained mission disaster relief officers and/or their alternates Denominator: Total number of USG missions/embassies
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator reflects USG efforts to continue to improve disaster relief planning and management in US Embassies and USAID Missions. It is not practical for USAID/OFDA to maintain a presence in every country; however, humanitarian crises can emerge anywhere, even in developed nations. MDROs and alternates come from diverse backgrounds and are selected from among various Foreign Service backstops. Most do not have a background in humanitarian response. Therefore, it is important for USAID/OFDA to orient MDROs and alternates to the humanitarian arena and potential issues before a disaster strikes. In addition, since an Annex J is a requirement for all posts and provides information and guidance on coordinating and managing USG assistance to a host country, it is in USAID/OFDA's interest to provide training to MDROs and alternates so they can prepare their Annex Js.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Mission/embassy (count) How to measure it: This indicator is cumulative in that it counts all missions that have an MDRO and/or alternate that has been trained, whether in the current reporting year or prior to the reporting year. Divide the numerator into the denominator and multiply by 100 for the percent
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent

Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Program monitoring of records by DCHA/OFDA Operations Division/DASP trainers Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not capture the quality of individual MDRO and alternates' application of the training.
Baseline Timeframe	[2009]
Disaggregate(s)	Sex and nationality (US citizen /foreign national); Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	5.2.1-15 Number of hazard risk reduction plans, policies, strategies, systems, or curricula developed
Definitions	Hazard risk reduction refers to the prevention, mitigation, and management of natural (e.g., volcanoes, earthquakes) or technological disasters. The goal of risk reduction activities is to reduce human, social, economic, and environmental losses due to natural hazards and technological and environmental disasters. Various risk reduction activities focus on: the mitigation of livelihoods disruption by increasing a population's resiliency to shocks; prevention and early detection of health risks and malnutrition; infrastructure design/rehabilitation and policy on water, shelter, settlements, and land use that prevent or mitigate losses; and advocacy and training for better preparedness, understanding, and implementation of hazard management.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the output of capacity building, preparedness and planning activities toward improved disaster readiness for response and recovery from a natural disaster or technological risks.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Item (count) How to measure it: Tally the number of hazard risk reduction plans, policies, strategies, systems, or curricula developed with funding/input from OFDA
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Internal award tracking system (<i>abacus</i>) and implementing partner quarterly reports Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not measure the quality, effectiveness, or applicability/appropriateness of hazard risk reduction plans, policies, strategies, systems, or curricula. Without follow-up or standardization of curricula, this indicator is subject to some over-reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	[2009]
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

5.2.2 – Mitigation

Indicator	5.2.2-4 Kilometers of irrigation canals, drainage ditches, market feeder roads, and/or other measureable municipal services and/or market infrastructures rehabilitated
Definitions	The aggregate amount of kilometers of irrigation canals, drainage ditches, feeder roads, bridges, or other infrastructure measurable in kilometers rehabilitated with USG support. Municipal Services refers to water, sewer, and other such services that are likely to exacerbate the effects of a natural disaster and therefore require rehabilitation and contribute to disaster risk reduction, such as irrigation canals, water drainage ditches, etc. Market infrastructure that can be measured in terms of distance in kilometers refers to the physical items, locations and conduits that help people to produce, sell, transport and buy goods and services – comprising the supply chain. Examples include roads, bridges, feeder roads, etc. Market systems supply food and essential items or services related to basic survival needs as well as contributing to the supply or replacement of non-food items, agricultural inputs, fuel, tools and vital services. Market systems also maintain demand for labor, employment, or production that contributes to income and livelihoods restoration.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the degree of market infrastructure rehabilitation as a result of USG support. With rehabilitated municipal services and market infrastructure, the local economy and household access to markets and services should lead to greater food security and recovery from shocks caused by natural disasters or complex emergencies.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/ How to Measure it	Unit of Measure: Kilometers (count) How to measure it: Sum the reported number of kilometers of irrigation canals, drainage ditches, feeder roads, bridges, or other infrastructure measurable in kilometers that have been rehabilitated with USG support in the reporting year.
Use of Indicator	Reporting to bureau-level planners, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, in-country program managers, etc. for accountability of funds spent
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Monitoring reports and implementing partner reports Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not reflect the quality or sustainability of municipal services or infrastructure rehabilitated, or the extent to which kilometers of rehabilitated infrastructure has contributed to improved economic and livelihood stability.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	By type—irrigation canal, drainage ditch, road, bridge, other

5.3.1 – Protection and Assistance

Indicator	5.3.1-4 Percentage of migrants satisfied with all necessary services received, including en route care, maintenance, and transportation to Israel
Definition	Data for this indicator is entered at the bureau level by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM). Migrants: Humanitarian Migrants arriving to Israel Necessary services: As part of the grant agreement, those required services include pre-departure meetings/counseling in their home country, transportation to Israel, etc. “Satisfied”: Satisfaction is measured through survey reporting conducted by the United Israel Appeal. “<i>Satisfied</i>” is measured on the basis of: very satisfied, satisfied, sufficiently satisfied and not satisfied; anyone “not satisfied” is considered satisfied.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The Humanitarian Migrants to Israel program advances sustainable solutions for vulnerable migrants by supporting the resettlement in Israel of Jews primarily from the former Soviet Union and Ethiopia and providing them with services to foster long-term integration.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Unit of Measure: Individuals (migrants to Israel, reported as a percent) Numerator: Numerator is all those satisfied. Denominator: All those from the Former Soviet Union resettled during to Israel. How to measure it: Divide the numerator into the denominator and multiply by 100 for the percent
Use of Indicator	Reporting to Department of State Bureaus (F and RM), Congress, and nongovernmental stakeholders, for accountability of funds spent.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This information is provided to us by the implementing partner, United Jewish Appeal. It is collected by telephone survey for all migrants who have been resettled from the former Soviet Union. The survey is conducted by an independent third party.
Known Data Limitations	Third-party data collection may result in inaccurate data. The survey is also currently conducted for migrants from the FSU, which while making up the majority, is not the entire population of program beneficiaries.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline: 2010 – 98% satisfied
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

5.3.2 – Institutional Support and Capacity Building

Indicator	5.3.2-2 Percentage of countries participating in Bureau of Population Refugees and Migration-funded regional migration programs that strengthen or maintain capacity to screen and protect vulnerable cross-border migrants
Definition	Data for this indicator is entered at the bureau level by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM). Regional migration programs: In FY2010, following a strategic review of migration trends and programs, PRM/PIM decided to fund seven regional migration programs rather than numerous “stand-alone” programs as in the past. The seven regional programs include: Libya; Horn of Africa/ Yemen; Southern Africa; Southeast Asia; Northeast Asia; Mexico and Central America; and, the Caribbean. The total number of countries participating in these regional programs is currently 22. This includes 8 countries in Asia, 9 in the Americas and 5 in Africa. (Note: Technically the geographic coverage of the Southern Africa regional program extends to all 15 member countries of the Southern African Development Community, SADC. In practice, however, the program currently targets South Africa only.) Vulnerable migrants: PRM also broadened the categories of potential program beneficiaries beyond victims of trafficking, to include other vulnerable migrants such as stateless persons, unaccompanied minors, stranded migrants and asylum seekers.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Desired long-term outcome is better protection for vulnerable cross-border migrants (see definition above). The indicator serves to verify that governments in countries participating in PRM-funded regional migration programs are making tangible progress in providing an improved protection environment for vulnerable cross-border migrants present (whether legally or in an irregular status) in the territory.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure/how to measure it	Unit of measure is a percentage, with the numerator being the number of countries participating in PRM regional migration programs deemed to have strengthened their management migration capacity over the preceding year, and the denominator representing the sum total of all countries participating in PIM regional migration programs. PRM will deem that programs have strengthened the migration management capacity of a country if a minimum of three of the following criteria are met: • Country participates in a regional consultative process on migration; • Country establishes or strengthens, and implements, operational procedures for identification and assistance to vulnerable migrants (including but not limited to victims of trafficking, unaccompanied minors, asylum seekers); • Country establishes or strengthens legal framework for identification and assistance to vulnerable migrants (including but not limited to victims of trafficking, unaccompanied minors, asylum seekers); • Country establishes or strengthens training on human rights and protection of migrants for police and other government employees who come into contact with migrants;

	Country and/or civil society establishes or strengthens public messaging or outreach campaign to raise awareness of human rights of migrants and dangers of smuggling and trafficking.
Use of Indicator	Indicator will be used to ascertain progress in meeting our longer-term objective (improved protection of migrants), and to help inform PRM staff, Bureau leadership and staff of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) as our exclusive implementing partner whether the strategy we have devised to realize that objective is appropriate. May result in or help to inform program adjustments and/or reallocation of budgetary support (from one type of activity to another, one set of countries or regions to another, etc.).
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data source will primarily be IOM field staff responsible for implementation of PRM's regional migration programs; however we will also rely on RefCords. US Embassy officers and (where feasible) local NGOs and other third parties to help determine whether host country governments have met criteria specified above. Information relevant to making these determinations will be culled from a variety of sources including review of project/program documents, especially IOM quarterly progress reports, and staff monitoring and evaluation (M&E) trips which may include direct observation of IOM collaboration with governments, key informant interviews and discussions with third parties (e.g., local NGOs), as well as reporting from relevant entities within the State Department, such as G/TIP and DRL..
Known Data Limitations	- Generally the type of data to be collected will be valid and represent a meaningful measure of progress in realizing the intended objective; however this may not always be the case everywhere. For example, a government may institute one or more training programs on human rights or protection of migrants, but whether such programs actually yield better results (from a migrant protection perspective) may not always be apparent. We have sought to offset these potential concerns by stipulating that countries must satisfy at least three of the criteria identified/described above. - To the extent we are/will be reliant on IOM to verify that programs the organization is implementing at our behest are effective and helping to achieve the desired outcome, concerns about integrity of information they provide will always be present. We will look to other sources - RefCords and US Embassy personnel, as well as non-USG interlocutors (e.g., local NGOs) - to provide additional and more reliably unbiased information relevant to making determinations as to whether a given country has strengthened or maintained capacity to screen and protect vulnerable cross-border migrants. - Measures are "reasonably precise," some more so than others. E.g., whether or not a country participates in a regional consultative process is easily and precisely ascertained. Whether it has "strengthened" legal frameworks, operational procedures or training programs is not so easily or precisely determined. - Reliability — See commentary under b) and c) immediately above. - Timeliness — Timeliness of data is ensured through IOM quarterly progress reports.

Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator